

Remarks

Claims 1-11 and 18-24 are pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration. Claims 1-8, 10-11, and 18-24 have been amended. Claims 12-17 were previously canceled. Claim remains in the application unchanged. No new matter has been added.

Claim Remumbering

The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. Claims 12-17 were previously canceled and new claims 18-24 were previously added but incorrectly numbered 12-18. The numbering of claims 18-24 have been corrected through amendment herein. The objection to the claim numbering is now overcome.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has provided a number of examples of claim deficiencies denoting possible antecedent issue. Specifically, the Examiner provides a non-inclusive list of examples, including:

Claim 1, line 5, change "the reading" to --a reading--.

Claim 1, lines 5-6, change "the geometric area" to --a geometric area--.

Claim 1, line 8, change "the amount" to --an amount--.

Claim 2, line 5, replace "as they" with the word --to--.

Claim 2, line 4, replace "The combined geometric area" to --a combined geometric area--.

Claim 3, line 4, replace "The combined geometric".

Claim 3, line 5, replace "as they" with the word --to--.

Claim 4, line 3, replace "said tape speed" with --a tape speed--.

Claim 5, line 2, replace "said alternative tape" to --an alternative tape--.

Claim 6, line 3, replace "said gap width" to --varying gap width--.

Claim 7, line 3, replace "said head offset spacing" with --a head offset spacing--.

Claim 8, line 9, replace "the amount" to --an amount--.

Claim 8, line 11, replace "the amount" to --an amount--.

Claim 10, line 2, replace "said alternative tape" to --an alternative tape--.

Claim 11, line 3, replace "said gap width" with --a gap width--.

Claim 18, line 5, replace "the reading" with --a reading--.

Claim 18, line 6, replace "the geometric area" with --a geometric area--.

Claim 18, line 8, replace "the amount" with --an amount--.

Claim 19, line 4, replace "the combined geometric area" with --a combined geometric area--.

Claims 1-8, 10-11, and 18-24 have been amended to correct all of the above-identified and additionally discovered antecedent basis problems. Support for the Amendments may be found at least at page 12, lines 5-16 and page 13, lines 7-16 of the Specification. The Applicant respectfully submits that the objections to the claims are now overcome.

Specification Objections

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- page 1, line 4, after "09/176,079", --now U.S. Patent 6,307,701-- should be inserted.
- page 1, line 8, after "09/176,015", --now U.S. Patent 6,381,706-- should be inserted.
- page 1, line 4, after "09/176,014", --now U.S. Patent 6,367,047-- should be inserted.
- page 14, line 25, the word "he" should be replaced with --the--.

The specification has been amended to correct these items.

Additionally, the disclosure is objected to because the terms "like azimuth" and "unlike azimuth" are unclear within the context of the written description. The Specification has been amended to replace the terms "like-azimuth heads" with --heads having identical azimuth angles--, "like-azimuth track" with --track recorded along an identical azimuth angle, and "unlike-azimuth tracks" with --recorded along different azimuth angles--. Support for these amendments may be found in

the Specification at least at page 2, first paragraph. The Applicant believes that the amendments to the specification, which remove all "like-" and "unlike-" azimuth terminology, and replace them with more descriptive language, serves to clarify the written description and therefore overcomes the objection.

In addition, the disclosure is objected to for the typographical error at page 14, line 25, wherein the word "he" should be replaced with the word --the--. The replacement has been made by amendment herein.

Applicant respectfully submits that the objections to the specification are now overcome.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-11 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to Claim 1, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the amount of overlap" in line 8. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the limitations, which has resulted in the removal of the limitation "the amount of overlap". Support for the Amendments to Claim 1 may be found at least at page 12, lines 5-16 of the Specification. This rejection is now overcome.

With regard to Claim 19, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations "the geometric area" in line 4, "the read simulation element" in line 3, "the coverage determination" in line 6, and "the amount of overlap" in lines 6-7. Claim 19 has been amended to recite "a combined geometric area". Claim 19 has been amended to depend from Claim 18 instead of Claim 1, which corrects the antecedent basis problem for the limitations "the read simulation element" and "the coverage determination element". The limitation "the geometric area" in line 4 has been amended to --a geometric area--, Claim 18 has been amended to clarify its limitations, which has resulted in the removal of the limitation "the amount of overlap" - thus rendering moot the antecedent basis problem of the same term in Claim 19. Support for the Amendments to Claims 18 and 19 may be found at least at page 12, lines 5-16 and page 13, lines 7-16 of the

Specification. This rejection is now overcome.

With regard to Claim 20, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations "the read simulation element" in line 3, "the reading" in line 3, "the coverage determination" in line 6, "the combined geometric area" in line 4, and "the amount of overlap" in lines 6-7. Claim 20 has been amended to depend from Claim 18 instead of Claim 1, which corrects the antecedent basis problem for the limitations "the read simulation element" and "the coverage determination element". The limitation "the combined geometric area" has been amended to --a combined geometric area--, and the limitation "the reading" has been amended to --a reading--. Claim 18 has been amended to clarify its limitations, which has resulted in the removal of the limitation "the amount of overlap" - thus rendering moot the antecedent basis problem of the same term in Claim 20. Support for the Amendments to Claim 20 may be found at least at page 12, lines 5-16 and page 13, lines 7-16 of the Specification. This rejection is now overcome.

With regard to Claim 21, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations "the read simulation element" in line 3, "the reading" in line 3, "the coverage determination" in line 6, "the amount of overlap" in lines 6-7, and "the area" in line 6. Claim 21 has been amended to depend from Claim 18 instead of Claim 1, which corrects the antecedent basis problem for the limitations "the read simulation element" and "the coverage determination element". Claim 21 has also been amended to remove the limitation "the amount of overlap". Support for the Amendments to Claim 21 may be found at least at page 12, lines 5-16 and page 13, lines 7-16 of the Specification. This rejection is now overcome.

With regard to Claim 22, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the nominal speed" in lines 6-7. Claim 22 has been amended to depend from Claim 21 instead of Claim 4, which corrects the antecedent basis problem for the limitations "the read simulation element" and "the coverage determination element", and "the nominal speed". This rejection is now overcome.

With regard to Claim 23, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations "the read simulation" in line 3, "the coverage determination" in line 6,

and “for said alternate gap” in line 7. Claim 23 has been amended to depend from Claim 18 instead of Claim 1, which corrects the antecedent basis problem for the limitations “the read simulation element” and “the coverage determination element”. Claim 23 recites “an alternate gap width value” in line 4; accordingly, Applicant believes that there is sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “said alternate gap width value” in line 7. This rejection is now overcome.

With regard to Claim 24, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations “the coverage determination” in line 6, “the amount of overlap” in line 6, “the area defined” in line 7, and “said alternate head offset”. Claim 24 has been amended to depend from Claim 18 instead of Claim 1, which corrects the antecedent basis problem for the limitations “the read simulation element” and “the coverage determination element”. Claim 24 recites “an alternate head offset spacing value” in lines 4-5; accordingly, Applicant believes that there is sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “said alternate head offset spacing value” in line 8. Claim 18 has been amended to clarify its limitations, which has resulted in the removal of the limitation “the amount of overlap” - thus rendering moot the antecedent basis problem of the same term in Claim 24. This rejection is now overcome.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-11 and 18-24 are identified as having an indication of allowable subject matter, and are considered allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the objections set for in the outstanding Office Action.

The Applicant has complied with all formal requirements, including rewriting and amending the Claims and Specification to overcome each objection and each claim rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-11 and 18-24 are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this amendment, or should the Examiner believe that it would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



January 12, 2007

Jessica Costa, Reg. No. 41,065

The Law Offices of Jessica Costa, PC
P.O. Box 460 Crozet, VA
22932-0460
(434) 823-2232
(434) 823-2242 (fax)